

"THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE."—CHRIST.

The Christian Freeman.

A MONTHLY JOURNAL.

DEVOTED TO RELIGIOUS, MORAL, AND SOCIAL PROGRESS.

No. 8.]

AUGUST, 1859.

[PRICE 1½d.]

THE WIFE'S MISTAKE.

THE carriage stopped at the door, and in a few minutes Margaret Hale entered the apartment where her husband sat, wholly absorbed in poring over day-books and ledgers.

"Those tiresome accounts still," she exclaimed. "Will you never find time for anything but business, Ralph? Have you no taste for anything beyond figures?"

"Margaret;" but the sadness in the tone was unheeded, as she continued—

"We had such a charming evening at Mrs. C.'s. Capt. Hill related many interesting incidents of his residence in Egypt, and Mr. Warren, the famous young poet, read 'Maud,' and some of the most beautiful passages in 'Aurora Leigh.' I must read to you some of Romney's 'Great Thoughts on Duty.'"

She went hastily to her chamber for the volume. When she returned her quiet entrance was unheard by her husband, whose pen was rapidly moving over the almost interminable columns of figures. With an expression of impatience, almost of scorn, resting on her face, she hastily turned away.

"And this is the end of all my dreams of marriage," said she, as she reached her room. "He has a taste for drudgery. His pursuits and tastes are all common-place, and I must go from home to find the sympathy I need, to find those who will appreciate with me the books I love, and the beautiful in art, for which he has neither eye nor ear. Why did he not marry a woman who had neither heart nor mind to be continually unsatisfied?"

In the room she had left, Ralph Hale sat hour after hour, till his brain was weary and his eye-lids drooped. Then,

laying aside his books, he remained a long time in deep thought.

"God bless my Margaret," he prayed, "and give me strength to bear all things. Give me the power to make her happy."

Putting far away all thoughts of her husband's real nobleness of character, jealously preserving the memory of every slight difference in their tastes and pursuits, Margaret cherished the spirit of discontent, till it embittered every hour of her life, and sent suffering she never dreamed of to the heart of her husband, who would gladly have sacrificed every earthly good for her happiness.

A sudden and severe illness came to her while Ralph was in a distant city. One day during her slow recovery, the aged minister who had baptised her in infancy, was sitting by her side.

"Margaret," he said, after steadfastly watching her troubled face, "you are unhappy. I have seen it a long time. I should not recognize in you my once cheerful, happy child. May I not know what great sorrow has come to you?"

Then with sobs and tears she told him all her unhappiness. After a short silence, the old man spoke again, but there was sadness, almost sternness, in his voice:

"Years ago, Margaret, a wealthy merchant became involved in a speculation whose failure suddenly took from him the accumulated wealth of his years of commercial enterprise. There were a few years of weary, vain struggling to retain what he had lost, then deep despondency, a lingering disease and death. His wife and four children were left penniless. The oldest child, a boy of sixteen, had finished his preparatory studies and was about to enter college. By this stroke he found his prospects for the future clouded; but with a noble

self-forgetfulness he turned cheerfully into the way marked out for him, and walked resolutely in it.

"He obtained a situation with a merchant, who had known his father, where his faithfulness and untiring devotion to his duties won the confidence of all who knew him. During the first years of her widowhood, his mother had taught a private school for the young, and it was the boy's highest ambition to relieve her of this necessity, and give her the rest her feeble health required. I cannot tell you all his privations, his willing sacrifice of every recreation, his continued self-denial, that he might lighten the burden of those dear to him.

"Year after year success crowned his efforts. In the village where his mother had passed the years of her childhood and the first years of her married life, he purchased a pleasant residence for her, and then a lucrative business being opened to him, he came here.

"At the time of his removal here, accident revealed to him the fact that the widow and invalid daughter of one whose fortune was, by his father's advice, risked in that unfortunate speculation which had so changed his own life, were living in extreme poverty. To him they are indebted for the pleasant home that now shelters them, and for the delicate, thoughtful ministrations to their daily comfort.

"Now when the commercial world is clouded, and disasters crowd thick and fast upon him as upon others, his anxious thoughts turn to the mother and suffering sister in the little village home whose comfort depends upon him, to the other lonely fireside to which his constant thoughtfulness imparts its only light, and to his own home and the young wife whose happiness is dearer to him than life. For this, Margaret, Ralph Hale gives his days to incessant toil, and willingly sacrifices the social pleasures he is so eminently fitted to enjoy.

"I have been in these three homes. With a love that is almost reverence, his mother and sister speak his name, and with full hearts thank God for his life—that life so filled with the beauty of self-renunciation. The widow and daughter whose hearts he has made glad, tell of his numberless acts of kindness, of his

delicate and unceasing watchfulness, and daily they ask God's blessing on him whose life is a blessing to others.

"In his own home, the wife whose love should bless him, whose gentle ministry should comfort and strengthen him, turns coldly from him, because he prefers the happiness of others to his own gratification, because the pressing duties of life claim all his waking hours, leaving him little leisure for the claims of society, or for the high intellectual culture which few attain whose lives are not wholly devoted to it."

The old man continued: "Some men talk poetry, some write it in words, and some *write it in their lives*. The true heroism which poets have sung—the beauty of self-abnegation, and of ceaseless devotion to duty—which have been their inspiration, Ralph Hale has lived. The woman who has won the deepest love of such a man, should reverently and gratefully cherish it as the richest blessing of her life."

In the twilight of that day Margaret was awaiting her husband's return. Amid the bitter self-reproachings that darkened the hour gleamed a new and holy light. Higher purposes were aroused within her. In the future she would make divinely real in her life the beautiful ideals which had filled her heart with unsatisfied longings. She, too, would live for others, and first of all for him whom she had so misunderstood.

A hurried step in the entrance-hall, then on the stairs, and the next moment she was clasped in her husband's arms.

"You have been very ill," said a voice faltering with emotion, "but, thank God, you are safe now, my Margaret."

"Oh, yes, I am safe indeed, now," said Margaret's heart.

In that hour all was made clear between them. With new resolves for the future, with a deeper love for each other, and a prayer for strength, another page of life was turned for each.

Years afterwards, Margaret, a proud and happy wife, wrote—"I cannot tell you all he has been to me; my guide when I was ignorant, my strength when I faltered, my best earthly friend always." What do I not owe you for revealing the mistake which had almost wrecked the happiness of both."

THE LORD'S SUPPER. A LETTER TO A FRIEND.

BY B. R. EASTES.

DEAR FRIEND,—I have no doubt but that you, in common with many a good and worthy Christian, have been prevented from complying with the last request of our beloved Redeemer, by the dark cloud of superstition which has been wrapped around it, by the prevalent conception of it as the *end* instead of the *beginning* of the Christian life,—and by its being too often made a test of faith in particular doctrines, as set forth in the creeds, catechisms, and confessions of faith, drawn up by fallible men.

Perhaps it may relieve you of some of your difficulties if we attempt briefly to trace its origin. If you look to the xxvi. chapter of St. Matthew, you will find that the Lord directed his disciples to go before him into the City, and make ready the *Passover*, and that in the Evening they all sat down together to partake of that National Feast. While they were partaking of it, according to Luke xxii. 19 v., Jesus said, "This do in remembrance of me," that is to say, in future meet and partake of this Ordinance, not in remembrance of your deliverance from Egypt, but in remembrance of *me*. Thus it is evident that the Lord's Supper is the Christian Passover. The institution of the original feast is fully stated in the xii. chapter of Exodus, and from that it appears to have formed an important part of the *preparation* of the Children of Israel for their long and weary pilgrimage to the promised land; and in the 11th verse there occurs this striking direction, "And thus shall ye eat it, with your loins girded, your shoes on your feet, and your staff in your hand, and ye shall eat it in haste." From this you will see at once that the Passover was eaten *before* they started on their journey; it was their last hasty supper *before* their flight. Now the Lord's Supper was designed to supersede the Passover, even as Christianity was to supersede Judaism, consequently it is the beginning, and not the end of the Christian's pilgrimage. It is at the Table of his Saviour that the Christian

should gird up his loins, take his staff in his hand, and start onwards toward the heavenly inheritance; and if he does so in sincerity, it will become to him a *saving ordinance*, for he will then go forth into the world and engage in his usual avocations in the spirit of his crucified Master, and whenever temptation assails him the thought of his religious profession and of his holy resolutions will enable him to rise above its power, and preserve him from falling into sin.

There are many, you tell me, who fancy they cannot die happy unless they take the Sacrament on their death-bed. This is the natural consequence of the mistake before alluded to. Just suppose the case of a person lying at the point of death, and desirous to partake of this Ordinance for the first time. I do not say it is wrong for him to do so—far from it—but I do say that he was wrong in deferring it until his race was run. Suppose him to partake of it just before the final summons comes, and I ask, What sin has it saved him from? Evidently none; except it be sin of refusing altogether to comply with his Master's solemn command. When speaking to professing Christians upon this subject, I have very frequently been met with the objection "I am not fit to receive the Lord's Supper." Now, when Moses, by divine command, instituted the Passover, he was directed to "speak unto *all* the Congregation of Israel." *All* the Israelites were to partake of it. Even so all the disciples of Jesus are to meet and remember him. Very peculiar were the circumstances under which Jesus instituted the Lord's Supper. He knew that one of his disciples would deny him, that another would betray him, and that all would forsake him, and yet he did not refuse them; nay, it was to them that he said, *do it* in remembrance of me. True, their after life demonstrated their worthiness; but if we could suppose a similar case in the present day, do you think any Minister of Christ would like to receive them as Communicants? I think not; and yet, remember, that Christ made no objection. Not fitted? Surely, if any one is fitted to become a follower of Christ, he must be fitted to remember his Master. I cannot think that any person has a right to question

another as to his worthiness to receive the Lord's Supper—"To his own Master he standeth or he falleth." Do you not remember the parable of the wheat and the tares? Jesus says, "Let *both grow together* until the harvest, and in the time of the harvest I will say to the reapers, gather together first the tares (that is to say, the hypocrites and the worldlings), and bind them together to burn them: but gather the wheat (all true Christians) into my barn." And that he wished—that he *will*—ultimately gather *all* into his kingdom is clearly proved by another Parable, where the Saviour is represented as commanding his disciples to go into the streets and lanes of the city, and bring in "the poor, the maimed, the halt, and the blind;" nay more, they were "to go out into the highways and hedges, and *compel* them to come in."

Christ, just before he died, said, "Meet and remember me." Suppose an earthly friend were to do the same; suppose him to be the father of a numerous family, and endeared to many by his generosity and love, and that just before he departed to a better world he should call his children and friends around him, and tell them that he had a last request to make, how anxiously would they listen, and when at length he said, "I wish you to meet, from time to time, just as you do now, in remembrance of me?" Would they not all answer at once, "We will?"—assuredly they would. If, then, the last dying request of an earthly friend would be held sacred, how much more ought we to regard the last request of him who died that we might live.

To conclude, it is now eight years since I was first asked to stop at the Communion, and I then replied that I was not prepared, but I was at length prevailed upon to remain, and I shall never forget the impression that was made upon me on that occasion. I have indeed great reason to bless God for having led me to comply with the last request of his dear Son. It has been to me, in many respects, a saving ordinance, and I humbly pray the Father of mercies to lead you into the same blessed path. It is the path of pleasantness and of peace, and rest assured that the more

you remember Christ, and the nearer you become like Christ the greater will be your peace on earth—the greater will be your bliss in Heaven. With earnest prayers for your present and eternal welfare.

TWELVE PLAIN QUESTIONS TO TRINITARIANS.

BY REV. FLETCHER BLAKELY, M.A.

1. Where in the Scriptures do you find the following expressions? "Blessed and glorious Trinity;" "Trinity in unity;" "Three persons in one God;" "God-man;" "God the Son;" "God the Holy Ghost;" "Two natures of Christ;" "Original Sin?"

2. What is the difference between the doctrine of three persons in the Godhead, God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, and the doctrine of three Gods?

3. Is man in nature as God originally designed, or is he not?

4. If as designed, did God make him corrupt?

5. If not as designed, who prevented God from finishing his work as he intended?

6. How did Adam fall without any original corruption of his nature, so-called?

7. If God decrees us to be born sinners, does he not make us be sinners; and then where is his goodness?

8. If God has foreordained whatsoever comes to pass, or brings upon us the necessity of sinning, how can we, in justice, be made accountable for our deeds?

9. Did Jesus Christ, by his sufferings and death, make God, in any way, more merciful?

10. Did Jesus Christ, by his sufferings and death, render, in any way, the obedience of man less necessary?

11. When a mediator is appointed for effecting an agreement between an innocent party and a guilty one, on which is he to work the reformation?

12. If the disciples of Christ ought to depart from iniquity, are the common apologies a sufficient excuse for the offences that abound.—*Non-Subscriber.*

TWELVE SERIOUS QUESTIONS TO BELIEVERS IN DEVILS.

1. If there is a personal devil, who made him?

2. If he is a created being, God must have created him; and must not his existence and power depend upon the sustaining power of the Creator?

3. If he can act only by permission, would it not be merciful and kind in the Creator to withdraw his sustaining power and thus prevent him from leading nearly all mankind down to the pit of perdition?

4. If a personal devil does exist, must he not be omnipresent, in order to tempt persons in opposite parts of the earth at the same time?

5. If he is omnipresent, must he not be infinite, and hence equal to God?

6. Can two infinite beings exist at the same time in infinite space?

7. As only one infinite being can dwell in infinite space, and if God should create (admitting it to be really possible) an infinite being, would he not annihilate himself in doing so?

8. If part of the human race are children of the devil, would not the Creator be exercising a prerogative not belonging to him, were he to punish the devil's children to all eternity?

9. If men must have the devil to tempt them to sin, what tempted him to sin?

10. If the devil sinned before he tempted Adam, was Adam's the original sin?

11. If the devil introduced sin into the world, was not Paul in error when he said, "By one man sin entered the world?"—Rom. v. 12.

12. As the devil is using all his powers to thwart the desires of God, when God shall have delivered the wicked into the hands of his Satanic majesty, for him to roast them in hell's molten sea for ever, do you suppose the devil will do it?—From the *Israelite*, a periodical of the Jews.

NINE SOUND REASONS FOR REJECTING THE DOCTRINE OF ETERNAL TORMENT.

1. Because it is incompatible with the

teachings of HUMAN REASON, *which is older than any written revelation.*

2. Because it is incompatible with the teachings of NATURE, *which is older than human reason.*

3. Because it is incompatible with the nature of the DIVINE LAW, *which is older than Nature.*

4. Because it is incompatible with the revealed character of God, *who is older than the divine law.*

5. Because it is incompatible with the revealed object of Christ's mission into this world.

6. Because it is incompatible with the Saviour's life and teachings.

7. Because those who avow their faith in it are not more virtuous, *as a class*, than those who discard it.

8. Because those who discard it are not more vicious, *as a class*, than those who believe it.

9. Because, if true, I am unable to see how the subjection of any portion of the human family to its infliction can benefit either God, angels, devils or men.

I will conclude this communication, extended beyond what I intended when I commenced it, by saying,—While I remember with gratitude what I have enjoyed for twenty years with those with whom I have been *honestly*, in theological affinity, I cheerfully part company with them, sincerely hoping that, ere long,—

Truth's pleasant track they'll *all* pursue
Till *each* THIS glorious truth shall view;
That Jesus died for *all* our race,
In heaven to give them *all* a place.

Yours,

RICHARD THAYER.

THE FLOWERS AT DINNER.

I HAD been upon the deck, perhaps for half-an-hour, watching the city we had just left, as it grew smaller in the distance, until I could only see the tall, slender spires, sending up through the Summer morning their signs of Heaven; and I had at last turned from watching all these to the blue waters of the Sound, as they lay throbbing under the clear sky, while the prow of our steamer cut a white wound deep in their heart, as she swept proud and graceful on her way.

Suddenly a cry startled me from my reverie—the soft, pleased, cooing cry of a little child; and turning quickly, I saw it reaching out its fat, dimpled arms to a string of tri-coloured beads, which flashed in the light, as its mother held them before its eyes.

It was a pretty babe, probably some months old, with small ringlets of saffron hair, and rosy, thick, dimpled cheeks, and blue eyes; and it was dressed very tastefully in its sky-blue cloak and white hat, around which was tastefully wound a white plume.

The mother was a young, short, pale, and quite pretty woman. She was dressed plainly, and I saw at once she had expended her taste and limited means upon her child's dress, rather than her own.

When I first saw her, she was playing with her child, using a thousand mother arts and devices to interest and amuse it; but as the baby's eyes became fastened on some glittering object at a distance, an anxious thoughtfulness came into the mother's face, and her mind seemed to wander far off from the blue waters and the graceful steamer.

Somehow I felt interested in the young mother and her child. Perhaps it was because there were but few passengers on board, and most of these were below in the saloon.

At last I approached her. "How happy your baby looks this morning, ma'am?"

She smiled back pleasantly. "Yes, he is taking his first journey to-day."

In a little while the little woman and I had grown very well acquainted. I had learned, too, something of her history; that she was the wife of a young mechanic, residing in the city we had left, to whom she had been married about two years, and that she was now on a visit of a week to her mother in New York, who was an invalid, and had never seen the child.

"Grandma will be very proud of my boy," said the young mother; and oh, what a glance of proud tenderness she bent on the fair young face that had nestled against her breast!

But a few moments later the old, thoughtful, half-troubled look stole into her eyes again. Probably she read in

my face the interest I did not express, for, looking up to me, she exclaimed: "I don't know how my husband will stand it, sitting down all alone to his dinner to-day. Poor fellow, he never did such a thing in his life before."

"Yes, he'll miss you and baby, no doubt," I answered sympathetically.

But here the pale face flushed into sudden gladness. "He'll see the flowers anyhow!"

"What flowers?"

"Why, the bouquet I made him, just before we started. I set it close by his plate, too, for I knew 'twould comfort him so. There were two white roses—they opened yesterday, after the shower—and some Sweet Williams, and variegated Pinks and double Lady-slippers—the whole looked so pretty; and I placed 'em in my blue China vase; and he'll be so surprised and pleased, when he comes home to dinner, and finds 'em close by his plate, and he'll know who put 'em there, won't he, baby?"

There were tears in the little woman's eyes. I think they were in my own, too, as I looked on her with a new reverence, and thought how her husband was a rich man. No matter if he did earn his daily bread by the sweat of his brow, no wealth would buy that little wife of his, with her true, faithful, loving heart; and though he had neither lands nor gold, nor any other possession, was he not rich with her?

And then, I thought, as I went down stairs to rejoin the friends I had left too long, how many women are there on earth who never think of placing a bouquet of flowers to cheer their husband's lonely dinner hour—wives whose homes might be adorned with every grace, and filled with every luxury, and who yet found in fashion, and display, and frivolity, their only life! and who cared not, in their mad pursuit for these baubles, whether their homes were made bright and holy with sweet affections and gentle cares. Miserable husbands wedded unto miserable women.

The poor toiling mechanic, with his little wife, had found the "hidden treasure" that lies not in your lands, your gold, nor your costly houses; for had he not that "love" for which a man will give all his substance?—*Star of the West.*

MY RELIGION.

My religion is love, 'tis the noblest and purest,
And my temple the universe widest and surest;
I worship my God through his works which
are fair,

And the joy of my heart is perpetual prayer.
I wake to new life with the coming of Spring,
When the Lark is aloft with a fetterless wing;
When the Thorn and the Woodbine are burst-
ing with buds,

And the Thrush-note is heard in the depths of
the woods.

When the verdure grows bright where the
rivulets run,

And the Primrose and Daisy look up to the sun;
When the Iris of beauty expands o'er the plain,
And blessing comes down in the drops of the
rain.

When the skies are as pure and the breezes
as mild

As the smile of my wife and the kiss of my
child;

When the Summer in fulness of beauty is
born,

I love to be out with the blush of the morn;
And to pause in the field where the mower is
blithe,

Keeping time with a song to the sweep of his
scythe;

At meridian I love to re-visit the bowers
'Mid the murmur of bees and the breathing of
flowers;

And there in some sylvan and shadowy nook
To lay myself down on the brink of the brook,
Where the coo of the Ring-dove sounds sooth-
ingly near,

And the light laugh of childhood comes sweet
to my ear.

I love too at evening to rest in the dell,
Where the tall fern is drooping above the
green well;

When the vesper star burns, when the zephyr
wind blows,

When the lay of the Nightingale ruffles the
rose;

When silence is round me, below, and above,
And my heart is imbued with the spirit of
love;

When the things that I gaze on grow fairer,
and seem

Like the fairy wrought shapes of some young
Poet's dream.

In the calm reign of Autumn I'm happy to
roam,

When the peasant exults in a full harvest home;
When the boughs of the orchard with fruitage
incline,

And the clusters are ripe on the stem of the
vine;

When Nature puts on the last smiles of the
year,

And the leaves of the forest are scattered and
sere;

When the Lark quits the sky, and the Linnet
the spray,

And all things are clad in the garb of decay.
Even Winter to me hath a thousand delights,

With its short gloomy days and its long starry
nights,

And I love to go forth ere the dawn to inhale
The health breathing freshness that floats in
the gale;

When the sun riseth red o'er the crest of the
hill,

And the trees of the woodland are hoary and
still;

When the motion and sound of the streamlet
are lost

In the icy embrace of mysterious frost;
When the hunter is out on the shelterless
moor,

And the Robin looks in at the cottagers' door,
And the spirit of Nature hath folded her wings,

To nourish the seeds of all glorious things;
Till the herb, and the leaf, and the fruit, and
the flower,

Shall awake in the fulness of beauty and power.
There's a harvest of knowledge in all that I see,

For a stone, or a leaf, is a treasure to me;
There's a magic of music in every sound,

And the aspect of beauty encircles me round;
While the last gushing joy that I fancy and
feel

Is more than the language of song can reveal.
Did God set his fountain of light in the skies

That man should look up with the tears in his
eyes?

Did God make this earth so abundant and fair
That man should look down with a groan of
despair?

Did God fill the world with harmonious life
That man should go forth with destruction
and strife?

Did God scatter freedom o'er mountain and
wave

That man should exist as a tyrant and slave?
Away with so hopeles, so joyless a creed,

For the soul that believes it is darkened
indeed.

A BIBLE DICTIONARY.

HERESY OF A METHODIST DIVINE.

"THE world moves"—the theological world—yes, Methodist theologians are onward bound, we have proof, in this Dictionary, by the Rev. J. A. Bastow, a Primitive Methodist minister. To Bible truth, all sects, at last, will come, and *then* there will be one fold under one shepherd. We hail with joy therefore every sign of the approach of such a time.

The reviewer of this Bible Dictionary, in the *New Connexion Methodist Magazine*, from which we are about to copy, says: "To a very considerable extent the book presents a fulfilment of the author's promise to give a comprehensive digest of the history and antiquities of the Hebrews and neighbouring nations; the natural history, geography and literature of the sacred writings, with reference to the latest researches." We rejoice exceedingly at the *mildness* with which the reviewer notices the supposed errors of this work: once, nothing but a fit of rage and a shower of wrath greeted the writer bold enough to assail the Athanasian doctrine of the Trinity: now, it is different, very. We would gladly have copied the whole of the review to show its mildness, had our space not been so limited. A few paragraphs will show the Christian tenor of the *Dictionary*, and the gentle and Christian spirit of the Methodist reviewer.

"Mr. Bastow's views, as expressed in his article on the Trinity, are widely different from the received doctrine. He denies the eternity of the personal distinctions, and resolves them into mere personal developments or manifestations of God. Speaking of the Godhead, Mr. Bastow says: 'Unity appears to be God concealed, and Trinity is God revealed. The *Unity is God himself*; that is, simply in and by himself considered immutable, self-existent, eternal, and possessed of all possible perfection and excellence. But as to the Trinity, the Father is God as revealed in the works of creation, providence, and legislation; the Son is God in human flesh—the divine Logos incarnate; the Holy Ghost is God the Sanctifier, who reno-

vates the hearts of sinners, and dwells in the hearts of believers. The personal distinctions of the Godhead consist in these *developments*, made in time, and made to intelligent and rational believers.' 'Here,' says the reviewer, 'Mr. Bastow resolves the personal distinctions of the Godhead into mere developments and manifestations. He makes the developments and personal distinctions identical with each other;' for Mr. Bastow says: 'The personal distinctions consist in these developments.' These developments, too, are '*made in time*,' and therefore are not essential to the Godhead; and if the developments are not essential, neither are the personal distinctions, for, according to his view, they are identical with each other; so that if no development had been made, there would have been no distinctions in the Godhead. Consistently with this theory, Mr. Bastow tells us plainly, in the next sentence, that the personal distinctions are not eternal, and that from the nature of the case they cannot be eternal. He says: '*Strictly* considered distinctive personality, according to this view, is not eternal; and from the nature of the case it cannot be, because it consists in developments of the Godhead to intelligent beings, and those developments could not be made before those beings had existence.' If this be so (says the reviewer) the personal distinctions of the Godhead have had but a short existence, for there was a period when they had no being. Startled as we may be at the conclusion of Mr. Bastow, it necessarily flows from his own premises; for, if it be true that the personal distinctions of the Godhead consist in developments made in time, they could not be eternal. This amounts to a denial of any proper plurality of persons in the Godhead. God is now what he ever was and ever will be; and, if the personal distinctions of the Godhead are not eternal, there are *now* no personal distinctions in the Godhead. This is to deny the doctrine of the Trinity, as it is held by all orthodox denominations. For if the personal distinctions in the Godhead be not eternal, the only personality that is eternal is an *absolute unity*, to the exclusion of all personal plurality."

"We should have felt relief," says the reviewer, "in supposing that perhaps Mr. Bastow had, in the quotations we have given, expressed himself inadvertently, and that the error pointed out was rather in words than in sentiment; but Mr. Bastow, in giving his views, is careful to inform us that he speaks not loosely, but '*strictly*.' He says: 'Strictly considered distinctive personality, according to his view, is not eternal, and from the nature of the case it cannot be,' etc. In thus speaking, '*strictly*,' he compels us to assume that he here utters his well-considered and settled views, and expresses himself, in language carefully selected, and best adapted to convey his meaning on the great subject of the Trinity." . . . "Mr. Bastow says that the Scriptures 'nowhere represent them (the personal developments of the Godhead) under the polytheistic aspect of three separate consciousness, wills, affections, etc. Such a view would consist with *Tritheism*, or with all the polytheism which we can imagine to exist.'" . . . "Mr. Bastow says: 'All the efforts to prove that the Hebrews, before the coming of Christ, were fully acquainted with the doctrine of the Trinity, have ended in mere appeals to cabalizing Jews, who lived long after the New Testament was written.'" The reviewer attempts, in vain, we think, to refute these statements of Mr. Bastow.

The reviewer also discovers that Mr. Bastow's Dictionary of the Bible is not sound on the doctrine of the *Atonement*. We have before made the remark that every doctrine of orthodoxy appears like a key-stone in the fabric of their system, and if one tenet be disputed or renounced it weakens or leads to the overthrow of all the rest. This is the weakness of Trinitarianism; its doctrines are not individually strong—they hang together, and the whole chain is no stronger than the weakest link of the system. The reviewer says: "With all due respect for Mr. Bastow, we think he is in error. Mr. Bastow's peculiar views (on atonement) are based on his interpretation of the word *atonement*, which means reconciliation, or making *at-one* parties who are at variance." . . . "Mr. Bastow detaches the work of atonement from

the Saviour's death, and ascribes it to his intercession." . . . "There are several other topics, says the reviewer, on which we think Mr. Bastow's reasoning is inconclusive; but our space is full, and we must dispense with them, at least for the present. In conclusion, we shall be delighted to find Mr. Bastow laying aside his new fangled notions."

Again we express our pleasure at the *mildness* of the reviewer, and at the tendency of Methodist theologians, in spirit the one, and in doctrine the other, both are, it is our opinion, planting their feet in the good old paths of Bible truth and gospel life. These are no "*new fangled notions*" of Mr. Bastow's, but the old truths of the primitive Christian church, surrounded with a little Sabelian fog.

TAKE CARE OF THE HOOK.

BY MRS. H. B. STOWE.

CHARLEY'S mother would often sit with him by the fire, before the lamp was lighted in the evening, and repeat to him little pieces of poetry. This is one that Charley used to like particularly. It is written by Miss Jane Taylor:

"Dear mother," said a little fish,

"Pray is not that a fly?

I'm very hungry, and I wish

You'd let me go and try."

"Sweet innocent," the mother cried,

And started from her nook,

"That horrid fly is meant to hide

The sharpness of the hook!"

Now, as I've heard, this little trout

Was young, and silly, too:

And so he thought he'd venture out

To see what he could do.

And round about the fly he played,

With many a longing look:

And often to himself he said,

"I'm sure that's not a hook.

"I can but give one little pluck,

To try: and so I will."

So on he went, and lo! it stuck

Quite through his little gill.

And as he faint and fainter grew,

With hollow voice he cried,

"Dear mother, if I'd minded you

I should not thus have died!"

After this was finished, Charley looked gravely into the fire, and began his remarks upon it. "What a silly fellow that little trout was. He might have known better."

"Take care, Charley," said his mamma;

"There are a great many little boys just as silly as this trout. For instance, I knew a little boy a while ago, whose mamma told him not to touch green apples or currants, because they would make him sick. He did not mean to touch them, for he knew that it is very disagreeable to be sick and take medicine, but yet he did the very same thing that this little trout did.

"Instead of keeping far away, he would walk about under the trees, pick up the green apples to look at, and feel the green currants, just as the little fish would play around the hook. By-and-bye he said, 'I really don't think they will hurt me; I will just take one *little* taste.' And then he ate one, and then another, till finally he got very sick. Do you remember?"

"Oh, mamma, that was me. Yes, I remember."

"Now, Charley, hear what I tell you: nobody does very wrong things because they mean so, at first. People begin by little and little, just tasting and trying what is wrong, like this little fish.

"Then there is George Jones, a very fine boy, a bright boy, and one who means to do right; but then George does not always keep away from the hook. You will see him sometimes standing round places where men are drinking and swearing. George does not mean ever to drink or to swear; he only stands there to hear these men sing their songs and tell their stories, and sometimes he will drink just a little sip of sugar and spirits out of the bottom of a tumbler; but George never means really to be a drunkard. Ah, take care, George! the little fish did not mean to be caught, either, but he kept playing round and round and round the hook, and at last he was snapped up; and so you will be, if you don't take care.

"Then William Day means to be an honest boy, and you could not make him more angry than to tell him he would ever be a thief; and yet William *plays too much around the hook*. What does he do? Why, he will take little things out of his father's desk or shop, or out of his mother's basket or drawers, when he really does not want his father or mother to see him or find it out. William thinks, 'Oh, it's only a little thing;

it isn't much matter; I dare say they had just as lief I would have it as not.' Ah, William, do you think so? Why do you not go to your parents and ask for it, then? No; the fact is that William is learning to steal, but he does not believe it is stealing, any more than the little fish believed that what looked like a fly was in fact a dreadful hook. By-and-bye, if William doesn't take care, when he goes into a shop or store, he will begin to take little things from his master, just as he did from his father and mother; and he will take more and more, till finally he will be named and disgraced as a thief, and all because, like the little fish, he *would play around the hook*."

BUFFALO AND BUFFALORA.

PEACE and War, East and West—Buffalo and Buffalora—so we kept muttering these words after the mails from the East and the West had arrived.

Italy, they tell us, is a beautiful country. Grand and rich in sub-alpine scenery; mountains like palaces of God, stand pointing up to heaven; the clear blue sky embracing all, and the sun shining in its strength and sweetness; melodious on the plains are the strains of birds, and beautiful the shrubs and flowers; lovely place of lofty hill and fertile vale, land and water, plant, and shrub, and flower. Yet, in this theatre of beauty, there reigns the horrid demon of ugliness—War. The fields are covered with the dead; fire, and sword, and pillage devour the country; the cannon roars and echoes among the hills; the shrieks of the wounded and the dying pierce and disturb the air. The news of battle: battle after battle follows fast. Montebello, Palestro, Turbigo, Melanango, Magenta, Solferino, so they come that the slaughter at Buffalora Bridge may be out of your mind. There too at Buffalora man met man, Catholic rushed at Catholic, brother cleaved brother to the earth, amid all the beauty and natural loveliness of that country.

About the same time as that unhappy battle was going on, the mail from the West informs us of another scene in another land. In America, in a town called Buffalo, there stood a beautiful Unitarian Church; unfortunately it

caught fire and was destroyed. Wide are the doctrinal differences between Trinitarians and Unitarians. Among Protestants they occupy the opposite poles of thought on many doctrines deemed essential by each. Honour, everlasting honour to the Trinitarians of Buffalo. On the destruction of the Unitarian Church they met—not to sing a *Te Deum* for the loss of their opponent's Church—they met, drew up a sympathizing resolution, added the offer of their church, a part of the day, to the Unitarians, and carried this resolution of Christian kindness unanimously. These are the victories we long to see all the world over. This is the union that should exist among all churches. This was a lovelier sight by far than all the material grandeur, all the natural beauty of Italy.

Catholics are wont to boast of their unity, the oneness of their Church. Behold the sickening sight while they boast of their union in sentiment; they curse each other, body and soul, and march forth with the scythe of death, and mow each other down. *Buffalora* is a type of the dark, cruel past; Buffalo is a sign of the great good Christian future of love and peace. We still repeat the words, Peace and War, West and East, Protestant and Catholic, Buffalo and Buffalora. Look on *this* picture and on *that*.

THE EVIDENCE LOST.

A ranting Calvinist preacher, the Rev. Jn. Briggs, who held forth, in his way, at Newcastle-on-Tyne, about the beginning of this century, when Calvinists certified the eternal misery of Arminian Methodists as one of the divine decrees. The same eccentric Rev. J. Briggs, an old friend informs us, commenced his discourse one fine summer Sunday evening in his usual startling style. "John Wesley," said he, "Yes, John Wesley," he shouted, "is in *hell* this night as sure (and just as he said the word "*sure*," a large fly came buzzing up to his nose) as sure as I catch that fly," striking out his hand, at the very time, to catch the fly which he thought he had secured. He opened his hand to exhibit the fly, when lo, and behold! he had not caught the fly. "Never mind," said he, as the

people laughed at his loss, "the fly does not alter his state." They might have added, nor your uncharitable and wicked judgment of Mr. Wesley would in no way effect the condition of so holy a man.

END OF GREAT MEN.

HAPPENING to cast my eye upon a printed page of miniatures or portraits, the personages who occupied the four most conspicuous places were Alexander, Hannibal, Cæsar, and Bonaparte. I had seen the same innumerable times before, but never did the same sensation arise in my bosom as my mind hastily glanced over their several histories.

Alexander, after having climbed the dizzy heights of his ambition, and with his temples bound in chaplets dipped in the blood of countless nations, looked down upon a conquered world, and wept because there was not another for him to conquer, set a city on fire, and died in a scene of debauch.

Hannibal, after having, to the astonishment and consternation of Rome, passed the Alps—after having put to flight the armies of the mistress of the world, and stripped three bushels of gold rings from the fingers of her slaughtered knights, and made her very foundations quake—fled from his country, being hated by those who once exultingly united his name to that of their god, and called him Hannibal, died at last by poison, administered by his own hand, unlamented and unwept, in a foreign land.

Cæsar, after having conquered eight hundred cities, and dyed his garments in the blood of one million of his foes, having pursued to death the only rival he had on earth, was miserably assassinated by those whom he considered his earnest friends, and in that very place the attainment of which had been his greatest ambition.

Bonaparte, whose mandates kings and popes obeyed, after having filled the earth with the terror of his name, after having deluged it with tears and blood, and clothed the world in sack-cloth, closed his days in lonely banishment, almost exiled from the world, yet where he could sometimes see his country's banner waving over the deep, but which could not or would not bring him aid.

"A CAUSE OF DIFFICULTIES IN UNDERSTANDING THE SCRIPTURES."

IRISH UNITARIAN MAGAZINE.

Continued from page 9.

III. "THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN" is another Scripture phrase which is very much misunderstood. When persons speak of "the kingdom of heaven," they always mean by it, *the abode of the righteous hereafter*; and, when they talk of men "entering into the kingdom of heaven," they understand by it, *men's gaining admission into the "many-mansioned house."* Now, this is not always the meaning this phrase has in the Scriptures,—nor is this its most frequent meaning. As used in the New Testament, it most frequently means *Christianity*,—the *gospel dispensation*,—that heavenly kingdom of *peace*, and *truth*, and *righteousness*, which Jesus came to establish in this lower world. Let us examine one or two passages in which this expression occurs, and you will be satisfied that this *must* be its meaning. John the Baptist, in Matthew iii. 2, is represented as exhorting the people to "repent, for the *kingdom of heaven* is at hand." Does he, by this, mean to say, that they were soon to be ushered into eternity? By no means: he merely requires them to repent of their sins, and reform their lives, in order that they might be qualified to partake of the benefits and blessings of the *Christian religion*, which were so soon to be presented to them.

In Matthew xix. 24, our Blessed Master is represented as saying—"It is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle, than for a *rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven.*" For a camel to pass through a needle's eye is *impossible*! Does Christ then wish, or intend to teach, that it is impossible for a rich man to obtain admission into *everlasting glory*? No: oh, no! Riches, instead of in any way disqualifying a man for *that*, will, if judiciously used,—if spent in the alleviation of distress, and works of liberality,—rather promote than retard a man's entrance into the realms of joy and light. He merely means that it would be *very difficult*, not impossible—for, the comparison to a "needle's eye," like all the Eastern figures, is too strong, and expresses more than was intended to be conveyed—for a rich man to become a *Christian*, in his day, seeing the persecutions and losses to which the professors of Christianity were invariably exposed. Of the difficulty which men had in becoming Christians, in those days, we can form some idea from the fact that, in our Saviour's lifetime, there were only two rich men among all his followers,—Joseph of Arimathea, and Nicodemus,—and even these two were not his *open* and *avowed* friends; for we are told that one of them came to him "privately, by night," and the other was his disciple "secretly for fear of the Jews."

In the same gospel (xvi. 19), Jesus says to Peter, "I will give to thee the keys of the *kingdom of heaven*," etc. Are we to understand by this, that Christ has formally delivered over to this timid apostle, the power of admitting men into, or excluding men from, the "company of

the just made perfect," hereafter? That, thank God, does not depend upon Peter, or upon any other man inspired or uninspired, but on our "own keeping of the commandments." No: Christ in these much-canvassed words, merely means to say, that he would give to Peter the power of admitting into the *Christian church*, both from among Jews and Gentiles, all those who were worthy of that honour, and of excluding from it all those who were unworthy.

There is one other remarkable passage in the same gospel, in which this phrase occurs, to which I would wish to refer, Matthew xi. 12:—"And from the days of John the Baptist, until now, the *kingdom of heaven* suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force." Does Christ by this strong language mean to say, that men were actually taking forcible possession of "the world of spirits?" The farthest from it possible. He merely means that, from the time at which John first exhorted the people to repent, and prepare for the reception of the gospel, up to the present hour, merely were crowding into the *Christian church*; and he mentions this circumstance in the presence of John's disciples, in order that they might go back and communicate to their master the agreeable news, that *Christianity was rapidly progressing*.

Remember, then, that whilst the phrase, the "kingdom of heaven," occasionally means in the Scriptures, the abode of the righteous hereafter, it more frequently denotes, simply, *Christianity*, or the *gospel dispensation*; and in meeting with a passage in which it occurs, it will be necessary to use your judgment to ascertain in which of the two senses it is employed.

IV. The word "WORSHIP" is another one which is generally used in an *acquired* sense. This word is now invariably employed as synonymous with *prayer*; whereas, in the sacred volume, it more frequently denotes *civil reverence* and *respect* than *religious homage*, and was customarily paid, not merely to Jesus Christ, but to all *kings, prophets*, and men of *authority and distinction*. When we read, in the Bible, of persons having been worshipped, we must not, by any means imagine, that such individuals received *religious adoration*, but simply and solely, that they received the civil respect and deference which was due to their rank. Some, when they meet with a passage in which Christ is said to have been worshipped, think that they have discovered, in this fact, an unanswerable argument for his deity, without ever reflecting, that the very same worship which is said to have been rendered to him, was repeatedly rendered to Daniel (Daniel ii. 46), to Elijah (1 Kings xviii. 7), to David (1 Chron. xxix. 20), to Joseph (Gen. xlii. 6), to Moses' father-in-law (Ex. xviii. 7), and to Solomon (Psalm xlv. 11); and, of course, would be equally efficacious in establishing *their* deity, as in establishing that of Christ.

But, some will naturally inquire, if the word "worship" is used in two senses in the Scriptures, how are we to know in which sense we are to understand it, in certain places; how are we to know when it denotes mere *civil reverence*, and when *religious homage*? The ordinary English reader can only discover this by a care-

ful attention to the context of the passage in which the word may occur, and the point which the writer seems desirous to establish it; but, the Greek scholar,—if he has only an honest desire to arrive at the truth, and not to uphold a system,—can have no difficulty, whatever, in the matter; for, in the original language, a *different word* is used when *religious* service is meant, from that which is used when *civil respect* is meant.

When *adoration*, in the highest sense, is meant, it is denoted by the Greek words, “*aineo*,” or “*latreno*,” which words are never applied to *Jesus Christ*, but solely to the Eternal One; but, when worship in an inferior sense is meant, it is denoted by the Greek word, “*proskuneo*,” which is frequently applied to Christ, and to all men in authority. If, then, *Jesus Christ* be the proper object of religious worship,—as some maintain that he is,—how comes it to pass that those words which, in the original language, denote *supreme adoration*, are never once applied to him, but are, invariably, reserved for God the Father, only? This question I have never seen answered; and, in my mind, it furnishes an irresistible argument against the doctrine of praying to Christ.

V. The word “*sinner*” is one which is generally understood in an acquired sense. As used in ordinary conversation, this word always means an *immoral man*; and most persons conceive that such is its meaning as used in the Scriptures, whereas, as there employed, it very frequently denotes simply a *Gentile* or *Heathen*. All Gentiles, let them be good or bad, in a moral point of view, are, in the New Testament, called “*sinners*,” so that a *sinner* and a *Gentile* are very often synonymous terms. This I can prove beyond controversy and beyond a doubt. The Apostle Paul in writing to the Galatians (Gal. ii. 15) says, “We who are Jews by nature, and not *sinners of the Gentiles*.” Here, you perceive, the Apostle designates all Gentiles as *sinners*; not, of course, because they were *all* persons of *abandoned character*, but because they were excluded from the Old Covenant, and debarred from those marks of the divine favour so abundantly conferred upon the Jews. The Scribes and Pharisees, in order to create an odium against our Blessed Lord, repeatedly reproached him with being “the friend of publicans and sinners.” Did they, by this imputation, mean to accuse him of being the associate and abettor of *abandoned men*. No; but they accused him of a crime, in the sight of the Jews not less heinous, viz.—the holding intercourse with tax-gatherers and Gentiles—two classes of persons detested by the Israelites—the former, on account of their profession, and the latter, on account of their extraction. So, in like manner, when it is stated, that “*Christ was gone to be guest with a man that is a sinner*” (Luke xix. 7), we are not by any means to suppose that the spotless Jesus sat at meat with the openly wicked, but merely that he partook of the hospitalities of a *Gentile*; an act which, in those days, was peculiarly offensive to the Jews, for no Jew considered it proper to sit at meat with a *Heathen*. There is one passage, however, not to

multiply instances, which incontrovertibly proves that the words *Gentiles* and *sinners* are often convertible terms; for Christ, in speaking of his own sufferings from the hands of the Jews, says in one place (Matt. xx. 19), “and shall deliver him to the *Gentiles*, to mock, and to scourge, and to crucify him;” but, in another place (Matt. xxvi. 45), when speaking of the same solemn event, he says to his disciples, “sleep on now, and take your rest: behold, the hour is at hand, and the Son of man is betrayed into the hands of *sinners*!” thus clearly proving, that our Lord looked upon the terms *Gentiles* and *sinners* as synonymous expressions, and here employed them to denote the same individuals. In meeting with this word, then, in the Scriptures, bear in mind that it does not always mean *bad men*, but merely *Gentiles* or *Heathens*, a name given to them by the Jews by way of contempt and reproach.

VI. If this be the frequent meaning of the word “*sinners*”—as I think I have shown that it is—it will materially assist us in arriving at the meaning of the word “*sins*”—a word perpetually occurring in the Scriptures. If I have proved that “*sinner*” does not always mean a moral offender, it naturally and necessarily follows that “*sin*” is not always a moral offence. We have seen that all Gentiles were contemptuously called *sinners* by their Jewish neighbours, not because of their immoralities, but because of their exclusion from the old covenant, and the privileges and advantages accruing therefrom; so, when these same persons are no longer designated by this offensive epithet, and when their “*sins*” are said to be “*remitted*,” the meaning must be, not that their *moral guilt* is remitted (for it was not by any means on account of their *moral guilt* that they were ever called by that name), but solely that they are recovered from an uncovenanted to a covenanted state, and admitted to privileges and advantages from which, as Gentiles, they were hitherto debarred. In one word, there are two kinds of sin spoken of in the Scriptures—*moral sins* and *ceremonial sins*; the former of which are remitted or pardoned solely on the ground of *repentance* and amendment of life, and the latter on professing faith in Jesus as the Messiah, and admission into the Christian church; and it requires the greatest attention to ascertain which of the two kinds is spoken of in any passage where the word occurs. When we read, “*repent and be converted*, that your *sins* may be blotted out,” the *sins* here alluded to are *moral sins*, which are blotted out upon the terms of repentance; but when we read, “*arise and be baptized*, and wash away thy *sins*,” the *sins* here alluded to are *ceremonial impurities*, which attached to all men who were not embraced in the new covenant, but which are removed from all who are admitted into the Christian church by the outward rite of baptism.

I shall best illustrate my meaning by examining one or two passages in which this word occurs, and applying the rule here laid down, and I shall select the most important. Our Saviour, in speaking of the cup which he gave to his disciples at the last supper, says, “For this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed

for many for the remission of *sins*." Now, most persons imagine that the *sins* here spoken of are moral transgressions, whereas our Lord means *ceremonial* transgressions; for we have no warrant whatever for supposing that the blood of Christ is at all efficacious to blot out our moral offences, unless we ourselves repent and turn away from them. All that our Lord wishes to convey by this language evidently is, that he died to abolish the old covenant and establish the new, by which all who are admitted into it are recovered from the condition of Gentiles to the condition of the privileged people of God.

Peter, in his first Epistle (ii. 24), says respecting Christ, "who his own self bore our *sins*, in his own body, on the tree." In this, as in the preceding passage, the "*sins*" spoken of cannot possibly be our moral offences, for, respecting these, the Scriptures, in the most unequivocal terms, declare that every man must bear them for himself. If there be any truth in the Bible more plainly taught than another, it is this—"Every man must bear his own burden." "The soul that sinneth it shall die." "Every man must give an account of himself to God." "The righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him." All which passages proclaim, in accents not to be mistaken, that our transgressions against the moral law shall be visited upon our own heads, and that every man, unless he repent and reform, shall suffer the consequences of his misdeeds.

Whilst, however, every man must bear his own moral sins, Christ has borne our ceremonial sins; for he, by his death upon the tree, abolished the old covenant, which treated all who were not embraced in it as "*sinners*," and established the new covenant, by which all who are embraced therein are designated as "*saints*."

There are several other remarkable passages in which this word is found, which I should be glad to examine and explain, did space permit, but these few, I trust, will be enough to prove that "*sin*" does not always signify moral guilt, but merely that state to which all men, whether Jews or Gentiles, are represented as being reduced, so long as they are out of the Christian covenant.

VII. The word "*saints*" is another which, like all the preceding, is generally used in an acquired sense. When men in ordinary conversation speak of saints, they always mean *peculiarly holy persons*, and they fancy that this is what the word always signifies in the New Testament, in which idea, however, they are quite mistaken. As there found, it generally means merely a *Christian*, let him be holy or unholy. All Christians are "*saints*" under the new covenant, just as all Gentiles were "*sinners*" under the old. That such is the case is a matter easy of proof. Paul, in writing to the church at Corinth, says, "all the *saints* salute you." That is, all the *Christians* at Ephesus send greetings to their brethren in the faith at Corinth. The same Apostle, in writing to the same individuals on another occasion, says, "now concerning the collection for the *saints*"—that is, respecting the collection which he was engaged in taking up for

the benefit of the *Christians* at Jerusalem. He also speaks of this same matter to the church at Rome, in these words—"but now I go to Jerusalem to minister to the *saints*"—that is, to minister to the wants of the *Christians*; and he adds, that he was engaged in "making a certain contribution for the poor saints," that is, for the needy Christians. Jude speaks of "the faith once delivered to the *saints*," meaning thereby the doctrines communicated to the primitive Christians; and the Apostle of the Gentiles, in writing to the Philippians, says, "to all the *saints* in Christ Jesus at Philippi: grace be unto you and peace from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ;" clearly showing that to be a believer in Christ Jesus and to be a saint means the same thing. From these few passages, which I have selected out of a multitude, you must see that all Christians are denominated saints, not because they were all persons of extreme purity of life—for such was not the case—but because of their being included in the new covenant and favoured with the spiritual privileges and advantages which it confers. Some religious professors of the present day, who arrogate to themselves peculiar sanctity, delight in designating their own fraternity as "*saints*," thereby insinuating that they are somewhat holier than other Christians that differ from them in opinion, without ever reflecting that, in the real import of the word, any or every Christian believer could establish as legitimate a title to the epithet as they.

VIII. "*Saved*" is another word frequently to be met with in the Scriptures, the meaning of which is very much misunderstood. To be "*saved*," as used in the New Testament, does not signify, as men in general suppose, to get to heaven, but to be delivered from certain calamities in this world. In a word, the salvation which is promised as the consequence of mere faith is temporal and not eternal: it is salvation from certain things in this world and not in the next: it is salvation not to everlasting life, but salvation from bodily diseases, from ignorance, from temporal calamities, and from Jewish superstition or heathen idolatry. I trust I shall be able to prove that this is its true meaning, from an examination of a few of the principal passages in which the word occurs.

1. I say it sometimes means salvation from *bodily diseases*. Our Saviour, on one occasion, having cured a woman who was afflicted with a loathsome bodily malady, is represented, by the Evangelist Luke (vii. 50), to have said to her, "Thy faith hath *saved thee*;" but the Evangelist Mark (v. 34), in recording this same incident, represents our Saviour as saying to her, "Thy faith hath *made thee whole*;" clearly proving that the Evangelists considered being saved and being made whole of a disease as meaning the same thing. Again: on one occasion Peter and John miraculously cured a lame man who sat asking for alms at the beautiful gate of the Temple, for which offence they were brought to trial before the Jewish Sanhedrim. Their judges, among other things, asked them by what power or in whose name they had wrought this miracle, to which the two apostles unhesitatingly

replied, that they had wrought it in the name of Jesus Christ, and by means of the power communicated to them by him; and added (Acts iv. 12), "Neither is there salvation in any other [that is, neither is there *restoration to soundness of health* in any other], for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we may be *saved*;" that is, there is no other name under heaven, and no other power communicated to men, whereby *such miraculous cures could be wrought*, except in the name and by the power of Jesus Christ. In this case, as in the former, to be saved means to be cured of a disease. I know that this latter passage is almost invariably misunderstood. I am aware that many, mistaking the meaning of the word saved, habitually quote it to prove that none but Christians will ever *get to heaven*!—a doctrine at variance with the clearest teachings of holy writ. Are we not assured that "God is no respecter of persons, but that, in every nation, he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted of him?" And are we not also informed that "many will come from the east and from the west, and from the north and from the south, and sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of God?" It is not of the manner of getting into heaven, but of *curing diseases*, that the apostle is here speaking, and we must not wrest the passage from its context to make it prove a doctrine of which the apostle was not thinking at the time.

But, 2ndly, It also means to be saved from *ignorance*. In Paul's first letter to Timothy (ii. 4), we read, "For God will have all men to be saved and brought to the knowledge of the truth." Here the latter clause of the verse explains the former, plainly showing that to "be saved" and to be "brought to a knowledge of the truth" mean the same thing. In this passage, then, salvation is deliverance from ignorance. But, 3rdly, It also means to be saved from *temporal calamities*. We read in the book of Acts (xxvii. 31) that "Paul said, except these abide in the ship ye cannot be *saved*," that is, from drowning. Again, in the same book (ii. 21), Peter says, "And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved." The apostle was previously speaking of the destruction of Jerusalem and the awful calamities that would attend it. He predicts that the Jews who would obstinately remain in the city would be destroyed; but that, at that great day, "whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord [that is, all the Christians] shall be saved;" that is, delivered from those calamities to which their Jewish neighbours would be exposed. And we know that such proved to be the case; for when Titus, with his destroying army, approached the city, the Christians, in consequence of the warnings given to them by Christ and the apostles, fled to Pella, a town at a little distance, and were thereby rescued from destruction; whilst the Jews, who persisted in remaining in the town to the last, were barbarously slaughtered.

Again, we are informed that Paul and Silas, on one occasion, were imprisoned at Philippi for healing a woman that had a spirit of divination;

that during the night they prayed and sang praises to God; in consequence of which the Almighty sent a great earthquake, which burst open the prison doors and loosed them from their bands. The gaoler who had charge of them, being suddenly aroused from his sleep, seeing the marvellous things that had happened, and being naturally and justly alarmed for his own fate, said to them, "Sirs, what must I do to be *saved*?" that is, from the *effects of the earthquake*; for it was for his own security that he was now frightened, lest he and his family should be crushed beneath the ruins. To which inquiry the apostles immediately replied, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." As if they had said to him, become a Christian, cease your persecution of us, liberate us from our bonds, and then God will save you and your household from that imminent peril in which you are now placed. And we find that such was the case; for, upon the gaoler becoming a Christian, and treating the apostles with civility, the earthquake was stayed. In these passages you must perceive that the word denotes salvation from temporal calamities.

But, 4thly, It sometimes means *conversion from Judaism and heathenism to Christianity*.

Paul, in writing to the church at Rome (Rom. x. 1), says, "Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be *saved*;" that is, converted to Christianity. In like manner, in the same Epistle, he tells the Gentile converts that, though the Jews are at present excluded from the Christian church, their rejection is neither total nor final: but that at last "all Israel shall be *saved*;" meaning thereby, that when the fulness of the Gentiles shall come in, then shall the children of Israel be restored to their former privileges, and gathered into the fold of the Redeemer.

After a careful examination of all these portions of Scripture, I think I am warranted in repeating the statement with which I commenced, viz., that the salvation which is promised as the consequence of mere belief is, in every case, temporal and not eternal; it is salvation from certain evils in this world, and not salvation to everlasting life. To be "saved," and to "inherit eternal life," are two very different matters, and are obtained on very different terms. When any one asked, "what shall I do to be saved?" the answer returned was, "believe;" but, when any one asked, "what shall I do to inherit eternal life," the answer returned was, "if you will enter into life, *keep the commandments*." The former being temporal, is obtained on the grounds of *faith* alone, but the latter being eternal, requires *good works* in addition.

Before concluding, I would request all who may read the foregoing observations, to examine into the subjects, here imperfectly discussed, more fully for themselves. I am aware that several of my explanations of Holy Writ may, to many, appear new and strange: but I have not put them forward without due deliberation and research; and I trust they will be found to stand the test of Scripture criticism.

WAYSIDE GATHERINGS.

BAD TEMPER.—An irritable man is like an hedge-hog, rolled up the wrong way, tormenting himself with his own prickles.

EDUCATION IN FRANCE.—In France, nearly one-third of the men, and more than one-half of the women, who were married in 1853, could neither read nor write.

HEAVEN ALONE.—Show me the man who would go to heaven alone, if he could, and in that man I will show you one that will never be admitted into heaven.

BAD PRIESTS.—Archbishop Hughes (Roman Catholic) has suspended the Rev. Mr. Dayman, of New York, for saying that "hell is paved with the skulls of bad priests," and other intemperate words.

BEAUTY.—It was once said of a beautiful woman that from her childhood she had spoken smilingly; as if the heart poured joy from the lips, as they turned into beauty.

THE NAME OF THE DEITY.—There is a beauty in the name appropriated by the Saxon nation to the Deity, unequalled except by His venerable Hebrew appellation. They call Him "God," which is literally "The Good"—the same word thus signifying the Deity and His most endearing quality.

A BIGOT.—The celebrated John Foster thus describes a bigot: "He sees religion, not as a sphere, but a line, and it is a line in which he is moving. He is like an African buffalo—sees right forward, but nothing on the right or left. He would not perceive a legion of angels or devils at the distance of ten yards, on the one side or the other."

THE DOCTRINE OF TOTAL DEPRAVITY.—A minister travelling in a missionary capacity, several years ago, was holding an animated theological conversation with a good old lady on whom he had called; in the course of which he asked her what she thought of the doctrine of total depravity? "Oh," she replied, "I think it a good doctrine, if people would only live up to it!" We have heard ministers urging their hearers to live up to some doctrines. What would living up to this doctrine produce?

THE POOR HEATHEN.—The following is an extract from a Tract published by the Missionary Board, Boston, entitled "*The Grand Motive to Missionary Effort.*" "The heathen are involved in the ruins of the apostacy; are subjects of a deep and awful depravity, totally unfit for heaven, and are expressly doomed to perdition. If the Christians of this land could stand together on some eminence near the gates of eternity, and see the sweeping torrent of deathless souls from the realms of Paganism, daily and hourly passing through, and plunging into the fathomless depths below, what eye would not run down with tears? What bosom would not heave with emotion? What tongue would not pray and cry aloud to God, that this river of Death might be stopped? A deathless soul, on the brink of hell, with capacities for heaven, and full provision made for its salvation! What a spectacle! Multiply this one by six hundred millions, and then contemplate the scene."

POPULAR PREACHING IN SCOTLAND.—There can be no question that, among the least intelligent classes in Scotland, a preacher's popularity is in precise proportion to the loudness of his roaring, and the violence of his gesticulations. "Our minister's a wonderfu' preacher," said a country bumpkin; "he while comes out wi' a roar just like a bull." "I did na' understand a word he said," was the remark of a maid-servant to a friend of our own concerning a certain dissenting preacher; "but I would go twenty miles to hear him again; I thought he would have dung the pulpit in bits; he was a' jumpin'!"—*Frazer's Magazine.*

HUMBOLDT'S CREED.—This great man has sometimes been charged by narrow-minded bigots with scepticism, a man living in the world, and approaching death, without God, and without hope! Read the following extract from his pen, and see if it looks that way. "The conviction—arising from a firm confidence in Almighty goodness and justice—that death is only a termination of an imperfect state of being, whose purpose cannot be fully carried out here, and that it is the passage to a better and a higher condition, should be so constantly present to us, that nothing should be able to obscure it, even for a moment: it is the groundwork of inward peace, and of the loftiest endeavours, and is an inexhaustible spring of comfort in affliction."

UNITARIAN PROGRESS.—An "evangelical" Dutch clergyman writes to the *Nonconformist*, deploring the rapid progress of Unitarianism in Holland. The entire population amounts to about three millions. Of these, two-fifths are Roman Catholics, and the remainder Protestants, chiefly of the Calvinistic Presbyterian Church. This Church, it seems, is Calvinistic only in name. Unitarian in reality. The correspondent of the *Nonconformist* says it "may be called a Rationalistic Unitarian Establishment." There is still, however, a section of the Church which holds by Orthodoxy; but being neither large nor wealthy—"the wealth of Holland is in the hands of the Rationalists and Jews"—an appeal for assistance is made to the "faithful" in Great Britain.

DEATH FROM THE EFFECTS OF 'REVIVALISM.'—A most melancholy instance of the dangers attendant on giving way to the immoderate excitement, which distinguishes the Revival movement, has occurred in the county Antrim. A respectable gentleman, engaged in farming pursuits, came up to Belfast to witness the monster Revival gathering in the Botanic Garden. His mind was greatly excited by what he saw and heard, and on returning to his home he had communication with his clergyman, by whose offices his mental agitation was greatly augmented. Symptoms of disordered intellect became speedily apparent; complete insanity of the religious type resulted: and a few days after the Revival meeting in the Garden, this unfortunate man died, leaving a family of children, who had been entirely dependant on him for their support?

All Letters, Post Office Orders, &c., to be addressed to ROBERT SPEARS, Stockton-on-Tees.

Printed by W. ROBINSON, High-street, Stockton.